REMARKS

Claim 3 has been amended to address the 112 issue raised by the Examiner.

Claims 29-35 have been cancelled.

The Art Based Rejections

Claims 1-12 and 14-18 stand rejected as being anticipated by the Kumada reference. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 specifically requires that the **server** be arranged to create the claimed calibration data. In contrast, in the cited Kumada reference, the client creates the calibration data. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding rejection of claim 1 (and the claims that depend therefrom) should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

More specifically, claim 1 specifically requires that a color matching server (a) acquire certain data from a client; (b) create color matching information based on such data (i.e., the color matching information is created **at the server**); and (c) send the color matching information to the client.

In contrast, the process described by Kumada contemplates that the calibration be performed by the **client**. Specifically, Figures 25 and 26 of Kumada are flow charts showing the calibration process (see ¶184). Initially, the calibration program is downloaded from the server to the client - network terminal 10 (see ¶185). Then the calibration process proceeds under the control of the client (network terminal 10) (see ¶185 - ¶194)– resulting in the creation of one dimensional LUT data (see ¶193). This data is then transmitted to the server (see ¶195) where it is stored in the calibration profile storage unit (see ¶196). It should be apparent that this is a very different approach than the claimed method, which requires that the calibration be performed by the server.

It is noted that the outstanding office action identifies ¶198 and ¶199 of Kumada as meeting the color matching information creating feature of claim 1. This assertion is respectfully traversed. ¶199 explicitly begins the descriptions of Figs. 27-29 and expressly states that it refers to a process carried out by the network terminal 10 (i.e., the client), and therefore it cannot meet the limitation of the color matching creating feature of claim 1 which specifically must be performed by the server. Furthermore, the process illustrated in Figs. 27-29 does not appear to be particularly relevant to the claimed color matching information creation step.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the outstanding rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

The wording of the other pending independent claims, (e.g., claims 2, 3, 4, 7, 15, 16, 17 and 18), vary significantly from that of independent claim 1. Some of these claims are directed at the server, while others are directed at the client and still others are directed at computer readable media associated with one of the server and client. However, each of these claims recite structures that effectively require the ability of the component to work using the basic server/client interaction discussed above. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all of the outstanding rejections should be withdrawn for generally the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

The various dependent claims are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to their associated independent claims. Furthermore, these dependent claims recite additional features that when considered in the context of the claimed invention, further patentably distinguish the art of record.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. It is noted that the various independent claims differ from the Kumada reference in a variety of other manners as well. However, since it is believed that Kumada clearly does not anticipate any of the pending claims for the reasons discussed above, the other distinctions are not articulated in detail in this response.

If any fees are required in connection with the filing of this response, including any fees required for any required extenstion of time, such fees may be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. YOKOP001). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/sdb/
Steve D Beyer
Reg. No. 31,234

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001